



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,968	09/26/2001	Zhenyu Gao	USP1664A-ZYG	5187
20995	7590	02/16/2006	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			PYZOWCHA, MICHAEL J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2137		

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/965,968	GAO, ZHENYU
	Examiner Michael Pyzocha	Art Unit 2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 13-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 13-28 are pending.
2. Amendment filed 12/22/2005 with a request for continued examination has been received and considered.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 13-17 are objected to because of the following informalities: claim 13: line 4 "web-contents" should be "web-content"; line 5 "dynamic file" should be "dynamic files".

Any claim not specifically address is objected to by virtue of its dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at

Art Unit: 2137

the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 13 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Groshon et al (US 6351811), in view of Korn (US 6880083), and further in view of Blickenstaff et al (US 5537585).

As per claim 13, Groshon et al discloses a public web server (figure 1 number 210) authentication checking, decrypting and sending a safe-web-file, wherein when a web visitor's request is received, said public-web-server computer checks said safe-web-file that if said safe-web-file is not altered, deleted or replaced, said public-web-server computer sends back said web-content decrypted from said safe-web-file to said web visitor with http or other protocol; the use of a firewall and the use of servers (see column 4 line 47 through column 5 line 9).

Groshon et al fails to disclose encrypting the web files and the recovery being automatic.

However, Korn teaches encrypting web files (see column 2 lines 25-38) and Blickenstaff et al teaches automatic recovery system (see column 3 lines 22-44).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Korn's encryption

Art Unit: 2137

and Blickenstaff et al's automatic recovery system in the protection system of Scott and Groshon et al.

Motivation to do so would have been to create a secure script (see Korn column 1 lines 55-58) and to provide disaster recovery (see column 3 lines 22-44).

As per claim 15, the modified Groshon et al, Korn, and Blickenstaff et al system discloses a real-time-check module used on said public-web-server computer for linking to a decryption module of said authentication check means to said web server, wherein said decryption module is able to be controlled by events of request received from said web visitor though http protocol (see Korn and Groshon as applied above).

As per claims 16, the modified Groshon et al, Korn, and Blickenstaff et al system discloses the use of symmetric key encryption (see Korn figure 1 number 107).

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Groshon et al, Korn, and Blickenstaff et al system as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Bianco (EP 0467239).

As per claim 14, the modified Groshon et al, Korn, and Blickenstaff et al system fails to disclose chaos encryption.

However Bianco teaches such chaos encryption (see Abstract).

Art Unit: 2137

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the chaos encryption of Bianco in the modified Groshon et al, Korn, and Blickenstaff et al system.

Motivation to do so would have been to protect the files from unauthorized modification (see Abstract).

8. Claims 17-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Scott, Groshon et al, Bianco, and Blickenstaff et al system as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Menezes et al (Handbook of Applied Cryptography) and further in view of Thomson (US 5276874).

As per independent claims 18 and 22, the modified Groshon et al, Korn, and Blickenstaff et al system discloses the limitations as in claim 13, but fails to disclose the files further including a header which includes a MAC and properties including name, size, date, and location.

However, Thomson teaches a header with the claimed properties (see column 2 lines 23-34) and Menezes et al teaches a MAC (see page 323).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Thomson's header in the modified prevention system of Groshon et al, Korn, and Blickenstaff et al and to include Menezes et al's MAC using the

Chaos encryption key as the key in Menezes et al's MAC in the header.

Motivation to do so would have been to store information relating to a file and to ensure the integrity of the file.

Claims 19-20, 23-24, 27 are similarly rejected as to claims above.

As per claims 16-17, 25-26, Menezes discloses the use of DES (see page 250).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the encryption scheme to be DES.

Motivation to do so would have been that it is recognized worldwide.

As per claims 21 and 28, Menezes discloses the use of MD5 (see page 250).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the MAC to be MD5. Motivation to do so would have been that it has widespread use.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Rosenberg (US 6363357) teaches using a MAC with header information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJP


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER